DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 383 JC 680 382

By-Hartman, Eugene L.
A COMPARISON OF SELECTED TRANSFER STUDENTS WITH A MATCHED POPULATION OF NATIVE STUDENTS.
Pub Date [68]
Note-15p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68
Descriptors-Comparative Analysis, Grade Point Average, *Junior Colleges, *Private Schools, *Rural Education, *Transfer Students, *Urban Education
Identifiers-*Missouri

At the end of their junior year, in three colleges of the University of Missouri, junior college transfers were compared with native students, using as criteria (1) size of high school graduating class, (2) high school rank, (3) sex, (4) age at college entrance, and (5) the college of the University chosen for the junior year. The colleges were (1) Arts and Science, (2) Education, and (3) Business and Public Administration. The transfers came from two large urban junior colleges, two small rural colleges, one church-affiliated and one non-sectarian private college. It was hypothesized that there was no significant difference in grade point average between transfers and natives when paired individually by the five criteria or by the sending institution. Findings included (1) a significant difference in GAP in the College of Education for both semesters and in Arts and Science for the first semester, but in Business and Public Administration for neither semester, (2) the GPA of the rural transfers equalled that of the natives, (3) those from private colleges had lower GPA's for both semesters, and (4) those from urban colleges had lower GPA's for the first semester but equalled the natives in the second term. Private school transfers had more difficulty than those from rural or urban colleges. The cause of this transition problem appears to deserve study. Rural students had no transition problem, urban students adjusted after one semester. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARISON OF SELECTED TRANSFER STUDENTS WITH A MATCHED POPULATION OF NATIVE STUDENTS

EUGENE L. HARTMANN
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

ED023383

In the first issue of the Junior College Journal, Nicholas Ricciardi stated that "...a fully organized junior college aims to meet the needs of the community in which it is located, including preparation for institutions of higher learning, liberal arts education for those who are not going beyond graduation from the junior college, vocational training for particular occupations usually designated as semi-professional vocations, and short courses for adults with special interest".

The accepted purposes of a junior college today are very much the same as when Ricciardi wrote his article in 1930. Preparing students for institutions of higher learning is one of the major functions of the junior college. As the number of junior colleges increase, the number of students participating in this program will grow.

The relationship of grades earned at the junior college and the grades earned at the senior college has been the subject of several research projects. Hill(1965) reviewed twenty-four studies of academic performance of transfer students and found substantial

JC 680 382

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
AUG 5 1968
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

agreement on the following points, "(a) grade points of transfer students from junior colleges drop during the semester immediately following transfer, but recover in succeeding semesters; and (b) transfer students from four-year institutions perform better academically than junior college transfers". This pattern is repeated in the studies researched by Knoell (1965), Young (1964), and Hood (1967). There is,however, very little in the literature which shows the probable cause for this drop in grade point averages.

In a study of the characteristics of junior college students, Cooley and Becker (1966) found that in terms of ability the junior college student looks more like the non-college student, but more like the senior college student in terms of socio-economic factors.

Martorana and Williams (1954) matched groups of transfer students with a group of native students on the basis of academic factors such as high school rank and test scores. They found that the grade point averages were not significantly different for the two groups.

The purpose of this study was to compare the grades of students who had transferred into the University of Missouri at the beginning of their junior year from selected junior colleges with

students who had similar academic backgrounds but matriculated at the University of Missouri as freshmen.

Method

The design of this study was to select students who completed their junior year during the academic years 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, in the College of Education, the College of Arts and Science, and the School of Business and Public Administration. The transfer students from junior colleges in this population were matched on several criteria with a random sample of students who matriculated at the University of Missouri as freshmen during the academic years 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65.

The criteria used for matching the two groups were: (a) the size of the high school graduating class, (b) the high school rank, (c) the sex of the student, (d) age at entrance to college, and (e) the college of the university enrolled in during their junior year. Transfer students were paired individually with native students on the five criteria used for matching.

High school graduating class size was arbitrarily categorized into three groups: (a) 0-100, (b) 101-300, and (c) 301 and over. It was felt that a division of this nature would help to match students who came from schools that had similar curriculums, facil-

ities, and school populations. High school ranks were transformed into quartiles before matching.

The junior colleges from which students in the transfer groups originated included: (a) two public junior colleges located in cities over 500,000 population, (b) two junior colleges located in cities of less than 50,000 population, and (c) two private junior colleges, one of which was church affiliated, and one which was non-sectarian.

Insert Table 1 about here

It was hypothesized that no significant difference in grade point averages between native and transfer students would be evident when they were matched on selected criteria. It was also hypothesized that no significant difference would exist when matching native students with those from metropolitan (cities over 500,000 population), rural (cities under 50,000 population), and private junior colleges respectively. The .05 level was considered to be significant for this study.

Results

A comparison of the means of grade point averages earned by

transfer and native students in selected colleges at the University of Missouri is shown in Table 2 and Table 3.

Insert Table 2 and Table 3 about here

The tables show that in the College of Education the difference in grade point average between native and transfer student is significant for both the first and the second semesters.

A significant difference in grade point average is seen for the first semester in matched students who enrolled in the College of Arts and Science. Student grade point averages for those enrolled in the School of Business and Public Administration were not significantly different either semester. The total native and transfer population were compared and show a highly significant difference between them for both semesters.

The paired students were then compared according to the type of college the transfer student had attended. Table 4 and Table 5 show the results of the comparison of means of grade point averages for this matching.

The transfer student from rural (population of cities of less than 50,000) junior colleges earned approximately the same grade

point as his counterpart from the University of Missouri.

Insert Table 4 and Table 5 about here

Students who transferred from private colleges showed significantly lower grade point averages than did the native students with whom they were matched. This significant difference was apparent for both semesters. Transfer students from metropolitan (cities with population of over 500,000) junior colleges earned significantly lower grades the first semester. The second semester grades did not differ significantly.

Discussion

The data from this study indicates that the grade point average of transfer and native students at the University of Missouri did not follow the pattern of grade point averages earned by students who were studied in the research of Knoell (1965), Hood (1967), and Young (1964). The significant difference in the first semester grade point averages did occur when the students were compared in two of the three colleges at the University, and when the total populations were compared.

The findings of this study differ from the research because

a difference in grade point average continued to be significant the second semester in the College of Education and the total population.

A cautious approach to interpreting the data is necessary because of some limitations inherent in this study. One of the limitations of this research was the lack of a criteria by which the students could be matched on academic ability as measured by a standardized instrument. A more definitive range for high school rank would help make the research more meaningful.

No controls were used to determine if the transfer student and his matched counterpart at the University followed the same curriculums during their freshmen and sophomore years. Students who enrolled in the School of Business and Public Administration had the least difference in grade point average. Several reasons could account for this lack of significance. This school does not enroll freshmen or sophomores, therefore all students are "transfers" during their junior year. It may be possible that the students who plan to enter this particular school at the University of Missouri follow a more rigid curriculum during their freshmen and sophomore years than do students who enroll in the College of Education or the College of Arts and Science. It should also be

noted that the transfer population which enrolled in this school contained only one transfer from the private schools.

It would appear that students who transfer from the private colleges have more difficulty in making the transition than those from either the rural or the metropolitan junior colleges. They would seem to be a major factor in the high significance level shown for the College of Education. A further study should be utilized to determine if this transition problem is caused by a difference in course background or some other factors.

Conclusions

Transfer students were matched on an individual basis with native students using a pre-established set of criteria.

The comparison between means of the total transfer population and the matched native population shows a high level of significance. The size of the significance level would indicate a need for further research to validate this study. A significant difference was reported for the grade point averages earned by native and transfer students enrolled in the College of Education.

The private college transfer student had a significantly more difficult time earning grades than did his matched counterpart.

The students from rural junior colleges had no problem in

adjusting to the course work at the University; the transfer students from the metropolitan junior colleges made the adjustment after the first semester.

In conclusion, it could be assumed that if the private college transfer student had been deleted from this study, it would follow the pattern established by researchers on other college and university campuses.

Bibliography

Cooley, W.W. and Becker, S.J., " The Junior College Student" Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (January 1966), pp. 464-469.

Hills, J.R., "Transfer Shock: The Academic Performance Of The Junior College Transfer", The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXIII (1965), pp. 201-215.

Hood, A.B.,"A Method of Comparing Student Achievement Levels at Different Colleges", Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (1967), pp. 793-803

Knoell, D.M., "Focus on the Transfer Problem", Junior College Journal, XXXV (May 1965), pp. 5-9.

Martorana, S.V. and Williams, L.L., "Academic Success of Junior College Transfers at the State College of Washington", Junior College Journal, XXIV (1954), pp. 402-415.

Ricciardi, N. "Vital Junior College Problems in California", Junior College Journal, I (October 1930), pp. 24-27.

Young, W., "Admission of the Transfer Student", Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (September 1964), pp. 60-62.

TABLE 1

Composition Of Transfer Population

College Enrolled In At The University	Transfer School Classification			
	Private	Rural	Metropolitan	Total
Education	76	22	46	142
Arts and Science	28	24	62	114
Business and Public Administration	1	22	23	68
Total	105	68	129	302

TABLE 2

A Comparison Of The Means
Of Grade Point Averages For A Matched Population
In Selected University Of Missouri Colleges

First Semester Of Junior Year

College	n	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
Education				3.281**
Native	142	2.466	.5987	
Transfer	142	2.196	.7068	
Arts and Science				2.9167**
Native	114	2.507	.6726	
Transfer	114	2.248	.6719	
Business and Public Administration				1.5064
Native	68	2.396	.6118	
Transfer	68	2.199	.6420	
Total				4.6099**
Native	302	2.462	.6283	
Transfer	302	2.216	.6824	

** Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 3

A Comparison Of The Means
Of Grade Point Averages For A Matched Population
In Selected University Of Missouri Colleges

Second Semester Of Junior Year

College	n	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
Education				2.7953**
Native	142	2.565	.6637	
Transfer	142	2.338	.7017	
Arts and Science				1.7630
Native	114	2.452	.7503	
Transfer	114	2.277	.7497	
Business and Public Administration				1.5055
Native	68	2.366	.6609	
Transfer	68	2.175	.5481	
Total				3.5435**
Native	302	2.492	.6989	
Transfer	302	2.290	.6998	

** Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 4

A Comparison Of The Means
Of Grade Point Averages For Matched Populations
Of Students From Various Types Of Colleges

First Semester Of Junior Year

	University Native	Rural Transfer	University Native	Private Transfer	University Native	Metropolitan Transfer
n	68	68	105	105	129	129
$\bar{X}$	2.509	2.291	2.467	2.214	2.408	2.207
SD	.6270	.7702	.6706	.6511	.6289	.6793
t	1.9078		2.7635**		2.4657*	

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 5

A Comparison Of The Means
Of Grade Point Averages For Matched Populations
Of Students From Various Types Of Colleges

Second Semester Of Junior Year

	University Native	Rural Transfer	University Native	Private Transfer	University Native	Metropolitan Transfer
n	68	68	105	105	129	129
$\bar{X}$	2.517	2.420	2.561	2.269	2.393	2.264
SD	.7166	.6750	.6777	.6604	.7274	.7181
t	.8084		3.1616**		1.4292	

** Significant at the .01 level.